REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated November 4, 2004. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8 are under consideration in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7 and 8 are being amended, as set forth in the above marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim applicant's invention. All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicant hereby submits that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejection

Claims 5 and 8 were objected to for minor informalities relating to improper antecedent basis. As the claims are being amended as suggested by the Examiner, the withdrawal of all outstanding informality rejections is in order, and is therefore respectfully solicited.

Prior Art Discussion

Claims 1 – 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) on the grounds of being anticipated by US Patent No. 5,713,652 to Zavracky et al. (hereinafter "Zavracky"), and were further rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) on the grounds of being anticipated by US Application No. 2004/0141155 to Wang et al. (hereinafter "Wang"). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Wang in view of US Patent No. 6,481,855 to Oehler (hereinafter "Oehler"). These rejections have been carefully considered, but are most respectfully traversed as follows.

The liquid crystal projector 1 of the invention, as now recited in claim 1 (e.g., Fig. 2), comprises: an equipment body 2 containing projection means 4 and cooling means 28 and including an air intake port 13, 16a, 16b, and an air exhaust port 10; a case 3 for housing said equipment body 2; and a sliding device for sliding said case 3 so as to take a first state in

which said equipment body 2 is pulled out of said case 3 and a second state in which said equipment body 2 is housed in said case 3. The air intake port 13, 16a, 16b, and said air exhaust port 10 are closed at said second state (Fig. 7B) and opened outside at said first state (Fig. 7A).

With such a structure, the invention prevents humidity and dust from entering the projector when the projector is not in use, miniaturizes the size of the projector to be more portable, and reduces noise from the ventilation fan when the projector is in use, the equipment body is pulled out of the case such that a distance between the ventilation fan and the exhaust port is enlarged so as to reduce the noise from the ventilation fan.

Applicants respectfully contend that none of the cited prior art references teaches or suggests such an equipment body of a liquid crystal projector "closing an air intake port and an air exhaust port thereof at a second state in which said equipment body is housed in a case directly housing the equipment body (Fig. 7B) and opening the air intake port and the air exhaust port outside at a first state in which said equipment body is pulled out of said case (Fig. 7A)" whereby the internal components of the projector are free to breath the outside air when the projector is in use according to the invention.

In contrast, Zavracky's slide projector mountable light valve display housing 100 is only a ***housing*** mounted to or connected to a commercially available slide projector 10 (col. 3, lines 56-61), but not a liquid crystal ***projector*** itself. As such, Zavracky's light valve slide assembly 200 only constitutes an equipment body containing projection means and cooling means of a projector housing, but NOT that of a liquid crystal projector. By analogy, Zavracky fails to disclose an intake port and an exhaust port of an equipment body of a liquid crystal projector which are opened and closed by the sliding movement of a projector case. Although Zavracky's display housing 100 closes the alleged air intake port and air exhaust port of the alleged equipment body 200 at a second state in which said equipment body 200 is housed in said case 110 (Fig. 4A) and opens the air intake port and the air exhaust port outside at a first state in which said equipment body 200 is pulled out of said case 110 (Fig. 4B), a commercially available slide projector 10 placed thereinto Zavracky's display housing 100 still can't breath as the liquid crystal projector 1 of the invention, since the case of the slide projector 10 will block the alleged ventilation 259 (Fig. 4B; col. 6, lines 6-15) outside of the slide projector 10.

Wang only has a casing 10 with a first housing 12 and a second housing 14 that is retractable relative to the first housing 12, but Wang does not have any intake port and exhaust port which are opened and closed by the sliding movement of the casing 10. Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, when the projector is not in use, the inlet ports 16 and the outlet ports 18 are **always opened** (rather than "closed" as alleged by the Examiner) independent of the movement of the second housing 14 (Fig. 3; [0025]). As Wang does not provide any additional mechanism to cover/close the inlet ports 16 and the outlet ports 18, they are open in Fig. 3 when they are aligned as they are open in Fig. 4 when they are separated as the first housing 12 is pulled out of the second housing 14 ([0025]).

Oehler was relied upon by the Examiner to teach attitude control legs. However, Oehler's elevator mechanism only includes an elevator shaft 60 having teeth 66. Such an elevator mechanism is commonly used in projectors. Oehler does not disclose any release buttons which are (1) pushed and concealed in the second state and (2) released and exposed in the first state by the sliding movement of the case as recited in claim 7. In addition, Oehler fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Zavracky and Wang as discussed above.

Applicants contend that neither the cited prior art references, nor their combinations teaches or discloses each and every feature of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the prior art as a whole.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference. Applicant respectfully contends that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance

of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

February 2, 2004

SPF/JCM/JT